DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 021 514 24 FL 001 036

By- Christensen, Clay B.

THE DEFINITION OF ONE LEVEL OF ACHIEVEMENT FOR SPEAKING AND FOR AUDITORY COMPREHENSION IN SPANISH.

Spons Agency- Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Research.

Pub Date Jun 68

Contract- OEC-4-7-068822-1638

Note- 40p.

EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.68

Descriptors- ACHIEVEMENT TESTS, *AUDIOLINGUAL SKILLS, COURSE CONTENT, CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT, *EDUCATIONAL OBJECTIVES, LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION, LANGUAGE LEARNING LEVELS, LANGUAGE RESEARCH, *SECONDARY SCHOOLS, *SECOND LANGUAGE LEARNING, SKILL DEVELOPMENT, *SPANISH

Summarized in this report is an investigation involving the speaking and auditory comprehension skills in Spanish for secondary school students. Two objectives of the study were to organize the Spanish language into basic syntactic structures and to prepare a description of expected learner performance for each of the structures. Proposals, based on test results, are made for a systematic arrangement of the structures which would provide the student with a segmented learning continuum in small units and the teacher with an overview of the structural content. Tables and a four-page list of references are included, and sample review materials and a criterion test are found in the appendixes. (SS)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

BR-6-8822
PA-24

FINAL REPORT

Project No. 6-8822

Contract No. OEC-4-7-068822-1638

PA 24

THE DEFINITION OF ONE LEVEL OF ACHIEVEMENT FOR SPEAKING AND FOR AUDITORY COMPREHENSION IN SPANISH

June 1968

FL 001 036
ED021514

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education
Bureau of Research

FINAL REPORT

Project No. 6-8822

Contract No. OEC-4-7-068822-1638

THE DEFINITION OF ONE LEVEL OF ACHIEVEMENT FOR SPEAKING AND FOR AUDITORY COMPREHENSION IN SPANISH

Clay B. Christensen

University of Washington

Seattle, Washington

June 1968

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a contract with the Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, ECUATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education
Bureau of Research

PREFACE

The present study aims to define one level of achievement for speaking and for auditory comprehension in Spanish. It is an attempt to define a part of the terminal performance of language skills to be expected of learners of Spanish at the end of Level II (i.e., the equivalent of two years at the senior high school stage). Since this project is concerned with syntactic structure, questions of lexical and cultural content have not been investigated.

The material herein assembled synthesizes the investigation and findings of a larger document. That document is forthcoming and will be presented as a doctoral dissertation, to be obtained upon request from University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, Michigan. The title of the dissertation is A Definition of Achievement Level II in the Control of Spanish Syntax. A portion of the dissertational study was conducted jointly by two principal investigators, J. R. Shawl and C. B. Christensen. The major part of the study, however, was divided so that each investigator worked independently on separate portions of the description of both language data and terminal behavior.

In the larger document each section is headed by the name of the individual investigator responsible for it. In cases where both investigators contributed information, the names of both are affixed to that section.

The investigators set for themselves the task of describing existing language data and of organizing them into sets of related structures. This task was viewed as a prerequisite for preparing a description of expected learner performance (terminal behavior) which could serve as a guide for testing the learner's proficiency in using the individual structures of Spanish. This definition of Level, in terms of syntactic achievement in the basic language skills, contrasts with existing definitions which are based on the number of years spent studying the language, or of hours spent in class.

This final report summarizes, mainly the investigation conducted in the area of two language skills: speaking and auditory comprehension. A companion report is being prepared by the other investigator. It is concerned mainly with the skills of reading and writing.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Summary.....1

1. Introduction.....3

1.1 Curriculum Development and Level Definition.....4

1.2 Objectives.....5

1.3 General Assumptions and Hypotheses of Language and Language Learning.....7

2. Methods and Testing.....11

2.1 Collection of Data.....11

2.2 Experimental Design.....11

2.3 Test Results.....15

3. Discussion.....20

4. Conclusion and Implications.....23

References.....25

Appendix A: Exemplary Review Materials of Group E1.....30

Appendix B: Criterion Test.....35

SUMMARY

In most American schools today, many students are learning foreign languages inefficiently; and one probable reason for this is poor coordination of the steps toward achieving a working knowledge of the language. One cause of the lack of coordination is that teachers do not have a common concept of what objectives constitute a Level of achievement. As long as foreign-language instructors are not provided with descriptive guidelines of language structures and specific criteria of expected performance of the learner in terms of the language structures, progress in the development of foreign-language curricula will be hindered.

The aim of this study, then, has been to specify the content of one level (Level II) of achievement. The content is described in terms of certain syntactic structures of Spanish. Two main objectives were set for this study: (1) the establishment of a basic corpus of newly-organized linguistic structures and (2) a specification, in operational terms, of expected, terminal performance of the learner for each of the linguistic structures. The linguistic description, a prerequisite for the description of learner performance, was carried out by describing and organizing language data collected from current pedagogical materials. The description and organization were conducted so as to reveal underlying relationships of related structures. This newly-organized conceptualization of material is expected to aid in the attainment of two general, educational objectives: an ideal methodological approach to language instruction and an understanding of what is expected of the pupil in terms of the structure of the language.

In connection with the general educational objectives, it is claimed that the learning continuum may be presented best by segmenting it into optimally small, learning units. It is also claimed that course content develops from discrete content items arranged systematically so as to provide teachers with an overview of the language structure for the purpose of making decisions in the area of course content. One such arrangement groups together related structures in sequential order such as to move from relatively easy structures to relatively difficult structures. This arrangement is facilitated by a linguistic description which specifies language structures in terms of their smallest syntactic constituents. In addition, such language description facilitates the operational description of learner performance in terms of the smallest individual syntactic structures.

Two null hypotheses were posited to investigate the value of two concepts used in the organization of the language description. These concepts are (1) the systematic grouping and sequential arrangement of language structures and (2) the verbal explanation of the interrelationships among related structures. Limited testing

was conducted for the two language skills of hearing and speaking. Under specific conditions, test results indicate that classroom presentations of systematically arranged structure and explanations of structural relationships are significant ($p < .05$).

Based on test results, it is proposed that a definition of achievement level for Spanish syntax be formulated in terms of (1) specific descriptions of the smallest, individual language structures such as those proposed in a larger document referred to in the preface of this report and (2) operational statements of learner performance in terms of those structures.

INTRODUCTION

Many American schools have made significant progress during the past decade in the teaching of modern foreign languages. Aims and objectives of language programs have received wide attention, applications of linguistic analyses and methodological approaches have been examined, a variety of pedagogical materials have been published, and language teachers have received specialized training through NDEA institutes. In addition, government and private funds have been allocated and spent to aid the development of foreign-language programs in America.

In spite of this progress, however, most American schools have not fully attained the goal of developing a well-articulated foreign-language program. Many theoretical problems and practical aspects of curricula development, which would aid in the attainment of this goal, have been impeded by the lack of a well-developed specification of course content to be taught at different levels of learner achievement. Foreign-language instruction in many American schools, in other words, is beset with the problems of how best to group teaching materials into progressive levels of achievement and of how to coordinate these levels into a smoothly articulated sequence.

Another problem facing foreign-language teachers is the lack of agreement about what language structures constitute a level of achievement. The fact that a natural language consists of an extensive set of vocabulary and grammatical structures of varying degrees of complexity seems to be the root of this problem. Due to the infinite range of language elements there is wide opinion about which grammatical structures should be taught at the beginning levels. In addition, there is lack of agreement about what criteria should be adopted as a means for devising a measure of evaluation in the classroom to demonstrate that the student has learned the structures. It seems to be a rather common practice among teachers to rate a learner as being either weak, average, or strong in all phases of the language-learning program by making a generalized evaluation from the results of a few varied tests. As the pupil continues through the language program, however, his proficiency involves varying degrees of strengths and weaknesses for different parts of the language structure. Thus, in the development of curricula, it is relevant to involve specifications of terminal behavior of all language structures at each level of the program.

The motivation for undertaking this investigation arises from an ill-defined notion of level and the lack of a well-articulated sequence of levels in second-language learning. If progress in the study of foreign language is to be made more efficient, successive levels of student achievement must be defined as part of a long-range effort to improve the articulation of these levels in a program of language acquisition.

CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT AND THE DEFINING OF LEVELS

Banathy (1966) has produced a theoretical concept invaluable for further progress in foreign-language curricula. In devoting a chapter to a review of more than eighty sources of pertinent literature, he was able to make some significant generalizations underlying the identification of processes connected with content selection and organization. His conclusions are paraphrased in the following six points:

(1) There is a need for an overall conceptual structure in the area of content selection.
(2) Curriculum operations are decision-making procedures, and these decisions need to be made on specific bases.
(3) There is a need for establishing an inventory of learning items to be considered the corpus of a particular course.
(4) Course content is generally viewed as a process of ordering individual content items into a learning continuum according to the rationale of moving, one item at a time, from the easy to the more complex, language structures.
(5) There is a need to organize the learning continuum in terms of grouping (what goes with what) and sequencing (what comes before what).
(6) There is a need to segment the learning continuum into larger and smaller time blocks until the smallest significant element, the learning unit, has been established.

Many state education departments and local school districts have devised their own curriculum guides. These guides attempt to define levels of achievement and give direction to the individual foreign-language sequences developed by the school districts. Curriculum guides, however, merely present general guidelines, and the definition of the proficiency to be attained at each level falls short of an 'operational' definition which is needed as a basis for measuring whether, or to what degree, the proficiency is present. The question is how can there be an indication as to whether or not specific goals have been achieved when specific goals have not been made operational? What is needed is a description of what the pupil learns and how he demonstrates that he has learned it, so that a close check may be made at successive points in the language course to examine whether certain structures have been learned. Such descriptions are lacking in current curriculum guides. For example, a typical statement of one objective found in most guidelines suggests to teachers that learners should 'obtain control of basic speech patterns.' While the general statement may be helpful, a more specific and useful statement would list the basic speech patterns and describe operationally how the learner may perform when he uses them correctly.

One purpose, then, of devising a formal and functional

definitions of levels is to delineate more precisely certain objectives necessary in assessing learner achievement. What is needed for assessing specific strengths and weaknesses of the learner is a thorough description of what is or should be expected of the learner. Before a comprehensive report can be given of a student's progress in terms of strengths and weaknesses, we need to know what he is to be taught.

OBJECTIVES

At the outset of this project one of the main goals was to map out a definite sequence of linguistic structures by which a specified degree of proficiency could be obtained in the four language skills of auditory comprehension, speaking, reading, and writing. It was discovered during the investigation, however, that a useful basis upon which to define a level of achievement in Spanish syntax is not the claim that a linguistics-based organization of instructional materials is a more efficient means to language skills. That is, the order in which certain language structures are analyzed scientifically does not necessarily determine the order of their application pedagogically (Saporta, 1966, p. 89).

A more useful basis upon which to define a level of achievement is found in the framework afforded by two fundamental educational objectives: (1) an ideal methodological approach to language instruction through a newly-organized description of a given language's structure and (2) an understanding of what is expected of the pupil in terms of the structure of the language. These two educational objectives may benefit by the knowledge obtained from the field of linguistics. But in this study we do not propose any kind of learning model. A strong and rich theory of foreign-language learning has not yet been developed.

For continued progress in foreign-language programs, it is important for curriculum developers and teachers to keep devising individual units of instruction and sequencing them effectively to optimize achievement in the classroom. Since the present study is concerned with the definition of a level of achievement, it is necessary to establish a rationale for such a definition. A rationale is provided through the framework of newly-organized language structures. The organization of the syntactic structures of Spanish present in this study is intended to aid instructors to be flexible in the preparation of smoothly-articulated teaching materials such as may result when one structure is viewed and presented as a logical relation of another which has already been presented and learned. Specifically, the earliest individual units of instruction of syntactic structures may be grounded in basic sentence patterns. Complex semantic features of particular syntactic constituents may be taught in relation to the underlying structures of those constituents and the processes by which they

are altered. For example, by means of the process of substitution, certain interrogative elements are viewed as derivatives of the adverbial elements found in basic sentence patterns. Furthermore, other, more complex units of instruction containing several transformations such as embedded or conjoined sentences may be taught in relation to the simpler basic sentence patterns already established.

The linguistic description in this study has been carried out by describing and organizing, in a new fashion, language data collected from current pedagogical materials. (see Methods, below). Instead of concentrating attention only on the overt patterns of the language involved, efforts have been made to look underneath the "surface" to view their basic structures. This procedure has been carried out to find common origins of dissimilar structures in order to relate them for the sake of organizing the description of terminal behavior. By employing current materials, and by appealing to modern linguistics we hope to improve the efficiency with which Spanish syntax can be taught to American learners. This newly-organized conceptualization of materials can be expected to aid in the attainment of the educational objectives mentioned above.

The result of our investigation is expected to be an aid to all Spanish teachers of Levels I and II. It is especially intended to provide them with a specific statement of how the learner may demonstrate his control of the structures. This intention is designed to allow teachers to come to a common understanding of which syntactic structures are basic for the beginning student and how the teacher may present them more effectively in order to guide the learner toward the goal of expected performance. The result of attaining more precision in defining goals should facilitate the exchange of information about curricular developments and evaluation devices.

The bases for obtaining the desired result are two specific objectives set for this investigation: (1) the establishment of a basic corpus of newly-organized syntactic structures to be agreed upon for Level II and (2) an operational statement of expected, terminal performance for each of the structures.

We have limited the linguistic scope of this project to a descriptive specification of basic syntactic structures for Level II of Spanish. Our endeavor has been to examine and describe, independently of their semantic content, certain syntactic structures and to arrange them in such a fashion as to signal the prominent interrelationships among the structural-types. A detailed specification of content (i.e., what ought to be talked about at the initial stages of foreign-language learning) must also be carried out, but such an investigation would proceed beyond the limits of time and energy imposed by this work. In connection with

content, it may be useful to point out to the reader that certain guidelines do exist. One up-to-date set of revised guidelines for foreign-language teachers is forthcoming from the State of North Carolina. The revision was presented in draft form in a state meeting of foreign-language teachers at Raleigh, North Carolina in December, 1967.

The second problem is to specify the expected performance of the learner. In compliance with stated educational objectives, we should try to put our goals of learner performance into operational terms which indicate whether the desired goals are being fulfilled. Stated differently, for each structural-type listed in the inventory of linguistics forms (see sec. 3 of the larger document referred to in the preface), an operational statement should be made to indicate what the learner does to demonstrate his ability to use the structures correctly, and under what conditions he does it.

The objective in defining one level of achievement of syntactic structures in Spanish is to equip the teacher with a set of specifications of Spanish structures and of expected learner performance in those structures. The language description is viewed as a prerequisite of the performance description. A specification of what the learner does to demonstrate his proficiency of certain language elements presupposes a description of precisely those language elements for which he demonstrates his degree of proficiency. The establishment of specific guidelines of terminal behavior for the smallest individual units of Spanish grammar may be fulfilled best by first setting down a description of those grammatical units. Such procedure has the advantage of allowing the investigator to arrange the data into sets of related structures in order to economize in the description of terminal behavior.

ASSUMPTIONS AND HYPOTHESES OF LANGUAGE AND LANGUAGE LEARNING

This study presents a newly-organized description of various language structures of Spanish, indicating certain structural features and interrelationships of their constituent elements. This aim is being pursued so that Spanish language teachers may be able to use the structures more effectively in advancing toward the goal of expected, learner performance set of Level II. It is assumed that an enlightened conceptualization of language data generally aids the teacher in making decisions about what structures should be presented together and which should come first. The organization imposed on the language structures, however, must in no way be construed as being a rigid arrangement. Definite knowledge is lacking about whether structure A should precede or follow structure B in order to maximize the efficiency of learning them both. Valdman (1966, p. 142) warns that "one

should....caution against too literal an application of linguistic theory in the determination of optimum learning steps and in the ordering of steps into pedagogically efficient sequences." Insufficient research has been carried out to disclose secure, rigid ordering of language elements for the purpose of optimizing the efficiency of language learning.

A question central to applied linguistics and foreign-language pedagogy is how to aid the first- or second-year learner in achieving control over the structure of the target language, to the point of being able to substitute freely among the available, structural alternatives. For example, in spontaneous conversation, native speakers of a language frequently use reduced forms (deletions or ellipses) of complete and full sentences. They can also produce the expanded or complete sentence from a reduced form, since the native speaker's intuition 'tells' him the origin of the reduced form and the relatedness of its constituent structures to the complete form. He intuitively knows the underlying structure of the reduced form, because of the redundant features (or clues) given in the language structure or in the situational context. But during the initial stage--even during the intermediate stages--the non-native cannot be expected to develop facilely that same native ability to the extent of easily converting from one syntactic pattern, say, a reduced form, to a corresponding expanded form.

It has been claimed (Saporta, 1966: p. 87) that the field of applied linguistics should not assume that what is learned comes by merely choosing a representative sample of utterances from the universe of language structure and generalizing about them. What is needed is a specification of what can co-occur with members of specific classes of sentence elements.

It should be one of the aims of pedagogical materials to facilitate the recognition of the relationships between related structures. Belasco (1965) argues that audio-lingual materials do not depart considerably from the grammatical principles found in the grammar-translation materials. The presentations are different, but the structural principles are essentially the same.

Many state and local curriculum guides encourage teachers not to rely exclusively on commercially prepared language materials, but rather to be inventive and produce their own materials to supplement the particular pedagogical approach. To carry out this aim, teachers may take advantage of the information provided by a newly-organized description of language features. A guide to structural relationships and underlying features of the language may demonstrate the possibility of teaching a small, manageable set of elementary constructions first, and then, by modification and combinations, converting these elementary constructions to add a larger set of possible sentences that a speaker of the language has at his disposal.

Without such information, teachers might invent pattern drills which include sentences with similar surface structures but dissimilar underlying structures. For example, one would not want to include in the same pattern drill two sentences such as 'Me gusta la corbata' and 'Me quita la corbata' with the implication that the syntactic elements of both have similar functions. To mix the structures in a drill may have the effect of causing the learner to generalize the surface structure indiscriminately in further learning.

Cases of this kind of structure-mixing exist in pedagogical materials. One such case was easily found in one of the three textbooks used as a source of language data for this study. The drill included the structures 'ir al cine' and 'jugar al tenis'. Obviously, the surface patterns are similar. The underlying structures, however, are dissimilar.

A newly-organized description of language data, which on the surface seem unrelated, may be viewed as sets or sub-systems of related structures and may aid the teacher in effectively teaching the structures. The description of language data in this study organizes the structures into 17 sets of related structures and features, such as basic patterns, adverbial elements, interrogatives, comparatives, etc. And although we do not suggest that, for example, the whole sub-system of interrogatives must precede or follow comparatives, the sets into which the data are organized may suggest a logical, orderly sequence. The sets may also suggest that the cut-off line between Levels I and II should be 'gerrymandered' so that one whole topic is made understandable, and is 'mastered', in Level I, and another whole agglomeration is left until Level II, where it can be treated as a whole sub-system of the grammar.

In connection with related structures forming sub-systems within the language, an important question is: Is it possible to prescribe the order in which materials within each sub-system should be presented to the learner? Such a prescription would have to be based on a knowledge of what is relatively simple and easy, and what is relatively difficult and complex for the learner who is to be taught. Since we do not have this knowledge, what we have done is to arrange the structures within each set in an order that appears logical, readily grasped, and readily retained by comparison with other possible organizations of the same materials. Only by extensive experimentation can it be determined what order is the most effective for presentation of each sub-system, and of the system as a whole, to a given learner or homogeneous group of learners.

In summary, since redundancy (Rivers, 1966: p. 197; Gleason, 1961: p. 382) and structure are fundamental to language, second-language teaching may benefit through a presentation that calls the learner's attention to the redundancies, underlying structures,

and interrelationships among the grammatical structures of the language. Such presentation may be carried out effectively through a process of showing the step-by-step derivation of the new structure to be learned from another, related structure already learned.*

If evidence can be obtained suggesting that by proceeding from a full form to a corresponding deleted (reduced) form a learner is aided in developing his use and understanding of the deleted form, then this evidence would suggest also that sequential presentation is meaningful in language learning; that is, the full form contains a certain amount of redundancy which may best be taught before its counterpart, the reduced form. The authors postulate (following Ausubel, 1963) that complex concepts can be learned more efficiently, i.e., with a less expenditure of time and energy, if parts of the concepts are presented in a sequence such as to begin with the more immediately understandable, in the light of the learner's prior experience (Lambert, 1963: p. 61). If grammatical concepts are indeed complex, as student testimony seems to establish, it would follow that the syntax of a foreign language can be taught the most economically by building toward presentation of the more difficult parts and of the integrated wholes.

In this study it is assumed that, although language learning is not necessarily a linear process, language teaching is, and that particular descriptions and arrangements of language structures can facilitate the course the teacher takes in effectively teaching certain related structures. It is not assumed, however, that there exists, a priori, only one order for optimizing the teaching of language structures. For the purpose of investigating the former assumption--important for the development of a definition of achievement level--two null hypotheses have been posited: (1) learners do not learn to discriminate between grammatical and ungrammatical structures any better when teaching procedures present related structures in a systematic order, and (2) learners do not learn to discriminate between grammatical and ungrammatical structures any better when teaching procedures make explicit the structures and interrelationships of related structures. On the basis of these hypotheses, limited testing was conducted to find whether or not any support could be obtained for accepting or rejecting them.

---

*One would caution against placing undue attention on grammatical dissection.

2: METHODS AND TESTING

2.1 Collection of Language Data

The linguistic description of this study centers on various syntactic structures of Spanish. The language data used in developing the description (See reference to dissertation in preface) were obtained from three Spanish textbooks. One textbook (La Grone, et al, 1961) was written primarily for first-year Spanish courses in secondary schools. Another (Mueller, et al, 1962) also written for secondary schools, could be used for a period extending beyond one school year. The third book (Wolfe, et al, 1963) was written primarily for the first-year college course.

These three textbooks were chosen on the basis of kind, variety, current popularity, and variety of publisher. The first two textbooks mentioned above contain only surface-structure patterns. They represent the dialogue apporach to the teaching of audiolingually oriented methods. No attempt is made in either book to formulate structural analyses or grammatical descriptions. The third textbook does contain a limited description of abstract sentence structures. It represents a more analytical approach to syntactic structure, but at the same time emphasizes pattern drills.

All sentences of the pattern drills and dialogues were extracted from each textbook and placed on 3 x 5 inch file cards for the purpose of cataloguing sentence-types. Descriptive and generative-grammar linguistics were used as a source of principles to aid in the description and organization of the language data into sets of syntactic structures. Specifically, descriptive linguistics was used to clssify surface language-patterns in terms of their abstract description classes (i.e., Noun Phrase, Verb Phrase, Prepositions, Objects, etc.). Generative-grammar linguistics was then used to investigate the interrelation of underlying structures in order to determine as nearly as possible, by linguistic means, the relationships among the surface structures. The relationships among the surface structures, then, became the guiding influence for organizing the patterns, originally gathered from textbooks, into sets of related structures.

2.2 Experimental Design

The experiment was conducted in secondary schools in the greater Seattle area. The experimental design involved primarily the language skills of auditory comprehension and speaking.

Secondary-School Experiment

Variables

Two variables were set up in a two-way-analysis-of-variance design consisting of two different sequences of structures and two different kinds of statements about the structural relationships between related structures.

Statements of Structural Relations	Method of Sequencing: systematically ordered	Method of Sequencing: regular order of textbook
yes	E1 systematic; yes	C1 regular; yes
no	E2 systematic; no	C2 regular; no

fig. 1

Description of Groups of Subjects (Ss)

Four groups of senior-high-school learners (Ss) at a beginning level of Spanish formed the nucleus of the experiment. The four groups consisted of two 'E' groups (E1 and E2) and two 'C' groups (C1 and C2). The teachers together with their classes of Ss were randomly assigned one of the four groups, and at least two different classes of Ss and their teachers comprised each particular group in an attempt to control the teacher variable. E1 had 76 Ss. There were 80 Ss in E2. 111 Ss comprised C1, and C2 had 112 Ss.

The textbook (Oller, 1963) material used in the classroom was the same for all four groups. The design of the textbook is such that the order of presentation of sentence-types (i.e., interrogatives, nominatives, relatives, etc.) is random; that is, the initial presentation of sentence-types and exercises for drilling the structures do not systematically group together related sentence-types.

Teachers representing the groups were selected on the basis of

availability and recommendation of district coordinators according to the coordinators' opinion of the teachers' similarity of approach. Some degree of homogeneity of presentation method existed among the teachers, since the foreign-language coordinators generally encouraged the adoption of the author's recommendations regarding the use of the textbook.

Twice during the first semester of beginning Spanish, the four groups received a "review" drill of the structures in the lessons studied. E1 received review material presented in a systematic order (See Appendix A) together with explanations of structural relationships (See Fig. 1). The structures were systematically ordered for E2, but no structural interrelationships were explained to them. The structures were presented to C1 in the normal order of the textbook and structural interrelationships were explained. The structures were presented in normal textbook order, but no structural relationships were explained to C2. In other words, the two 'C' groups received the review of the selected, related structures in the same "random" order in which they were originally presented in the textbook. The two 'E' groups received the same structures for review, but the sequence in which the structures were presented was systematically ordered in an attempt to draw out structural relationships. In addition to the order variable, E1 and C1 received explicit statements about the interrelationships among the main structures, which would be used as content for later testing.

The first review took place immediately after the first-half of the fall semester's work; the second review just prior to the December vacation. The duration of each review was four to six days according to the speed of the class. After the second review, all Ss were tested. The same test was again administered within the first week after the Ss resumed school work after the two week vacation in December. The purpose of the testing was to investigate the differential effect of the variables, if any, on the performance of the Ss of different groups and to measure retention of proficiency.

Preparation of Review Material

The review material was based on one textbook (Oller, 1963) which is currently being used in certain school districts of the greater Seattle area.

Two sets of review materials were compiled. The first set corresponded to the first three lessons of the textbook. The first review was given to all Ss after they had completed three lessons in the text. The other set, which corresponded to the first seven lessons was given as review material to all Ss after they had completed seven lessons. The Ss were given reviews

consisting of specific sentence structures (i.e., basic patterns, interrogatives, nominatives, relatives, and deletions). Each set of review material contained instructions for the teacher regarding the presentation of the materials.

Pattern drills were devised on the basis of vocabulary found in the specific lessons of the textbook. A variety of pattern drills was employed (See Appendix A) to help maintain the interest of Ss. Pattern drills for E1 and E2 were arranged to present first all basic sentence structures. In later pattern drills, the basic sentence structures were used as a basis for developing other sentence structures (i.e., interrogatives, nominatives, etc.). This arrangement was established for the purpose of drawing attention to structural relations among the various patterns.

For C1 and C2 groups, pattern drills of specific sentence-types were arranged in the same order in which these sentence-types were originally found in the textbook lessons. The result was that the order of pattern drills for C1 and C2 groups was 'random' as compared to the 'fixed' order of drills for E1 and E2.

The review materials designed for E1 and C1 groups included an explanation of structural relationships. For example, in reviewing the interrogative pattern ¿Qué + verb + subject?, the drill pattern would trace the derivation of '¿Qué da Juan?' by starting with the basic pattern 'Juan da algo' in the initial frame of the pattern. The second frame would substitute the interrogative element ¿qué? to derive 'Juan da ¿qué?'. The third frame would transpose the elements to derive '¿Qué da Juan?'. This derivation would be accompanied by an explanation of the relationships among the syntactic units involved in the pattern.

Preparation and Use of Test

A criterion test was designed to examine Ss' ability to recognize, by auditory comprehension, correct syntactic patterns and to produce, by speaking, various syntactic elements such as words, phrases, and sentences. The test was divided into three parts, and all test items were recorded on magnetic tape for uniform presentation to all groups of Ss. Part I contained forty-three Spanish sentences, twenty-one of which were syntactically correct. The other twenty-two sentences were syntactically incorrect. The order of presentation of sentences on the basis of correctness was randomly arranged. All Ss received the same random arrangement of sentences. The sentences, however, were ordered somewhat on the basis of difficulty with the easier ones being placed more in the initial portion of the test items. Ss were given instructions to (1) listen to each sentence spoken twice within a period of approximately eight seconds and (2) decide within a period of five seconds whether or not each sentence was syntac-

tically correct. The Ss marked each answer as being either "correct" or "incorrect" on an IBM answer sheet.

Part II contained twenty-five grammatical sentences in Spanish, except that somewhere in its structure each contained a blank space representing a deletion of one of its syntactic elements such as a word or phrase. In the recording of this part of the test, a bell was sounded to indicate the blank space. The group of test items was ordered on the basis of difficulty, with the easier items placed more toward the beginning of the group. Ss were given instructions to(1) listen to each sentence spoken twice within a period of approximately eight seconds and (2) invent within a period of seven seconds a word or phrase that could be used in the blank space as a logical part of the whole sentence. Ss recorded their invented responses on magnetic tape by means of a tape recorder set up for each S.

Part III contained twenty questions in Spanish. Ten questions were 'yes-no' questions designed to elicit a sentence with yes or no as part of the answer. The other ten questions were information questions designed to elicit a sentence containing specific information. As in the preceding parts, both sets of ten questions in Part III were ordered on the basis of difficulty. All Ss were given instructions to (1) listen to each question spoken twice within a period of approximately eight seconds and (2) formulate within a period of seven seconds an appropriate answer and record the response on magnetic tape.

Test Data Collection

All answers for Part I, marked by Ss on IBM answer sheets, were hand-scored by the investigator using a grid socring key. All answers for Part II and III, recorded by Ss on magnetic tape, were later replayed and scored on the basis of grammticality. For example, in Part II the response 'pronto' would be scored as "incorrect" for the test item 'Ellos van a (bell).' The response 'ir al parque' would, however, be scored as "correct." The answers to all test items were tabulated for further analysis.

2.3 Test Results

Earlier it was assumed that language teaching is a linear process; that is, the teacher presents the material an item at a time. It was also assumed that no one optimal arrangement of language structures exists, a priori, for the teaching of those structures. In this connection, then, two null hypotheses were established: (1) learners do not learn to discriminate between grammatical and ungrammatical structures any better when teaching procedures present related structures in a systematic order and

(2) learners do not learn to discriminate between grammatical and ungrammatical structures any better when teaching procedures make explicit the structures and the interrelationships of the structures.

Two variables, interstructural arrangement and explanations regarding structural relationships, were set up in a two-way-analysis-of-variance design for four groups of Ss (E1, E2, C1, and C2). The purposes of the design were to investigate the mean difference among all pairs of groups and to determine whether this difference should be attributed to chance alone (the null hypotheses) or whether it would be reasonable to conclude that the variables had differential effects on the learning tasks.

Table I shows the mean difference and significance levels of all pairs of groups for Parts I, II, and III, respectively, of the two criterion tests. An analysis of data indicates that Ss generally did better on the criterion tests when one or both variables were present in the instruction used with the particular textbook of this experiment. Pairs of groups which included C2 tended toward higher t values, resulting in the rejection of the null hypotheses. In auditory comprehension there was no significant difference on the first test between the two groups (C1 and C2) exposed to the textbook order of structures. Yet on the second test there was a significant difference between these two groups. This delayed significance may suggest the relevance of explanation of related structures during training to help learners retain a higher degree of proficiency in discriminating between correct and incorrect structures. Similarly, in auditory comprehension there was no significant difference on the first test between the E2 and C1 groups. On the second test, however, there was a significant difference which may suggest the relevance of systematically arranging related structures during training to aid the learner in discriminating between correct and incorrect structures.

Caution should be stressed, however, in an attempt to justify the value of either one of the two variables. The results of the tests indicate that there was no significant difference between the E1 and E2 groups and between the E1 and C1 groups. That is, the two pairs of groups (E1 - E2 and E1 - C1), in which one group (E1) was exposed to both variables and each of the other two groups was exposed to a different one of the two variables, showed no significant difference, and the null hypotheses were not rejected. Apparently, some other uncontrollable variable(s) (e.g., tensions derived from anticipating a vacation, different laboratory facilities in which the test was given to different groups, etc.) affected the behavior of Ss.

TABLE I

TEST 1

	Part I				Part II				Part III			
	Mean Difference	df	t	Significance Level	Mean Difference	df	t	Significance Level	Mean Difference	df	t	Significance Level
E1-E2	.65	154	1.04	*	-.13	88	.51	*	-1.42	88	1.72	*
E1-C1	1.41	185	2.71	p<.01	1.23	103	1.56	*	.19	103	.76	*
E1-C2	2.21	186	4.18	p<.001	2.13	88	2.40	p<.02	2.40	88	2.91	p<.01
E2-C1	.78	189	1.44	*	1.36	103	1.66	*	1.61	103	2.21	p<.05
E2-C2	1.57	190	2.87	p<.01	2.27	88	2.44	p<.02	3.82	88	4.91	p<.001
C1-C2	.80	221	1.76	*	.91	103	1.06	*	2.22	103	3.06	p<.01

* = not significant

TABLE I

TEST 2

	Part I				Part II				Part III			
	Mean Difference	df	t	Significance Level	Mean Difference	df	t	Significance Level	Mean Difference	df	t	Significance Level
E1-E2	-.30	154	.52	*	-.75	88	.24	*	.16	88	.62	*
E1-C1	.74	185	1.49	*	1.14	103	1.29	*	.73	103	1.10	*
E1-C2	1.68	186	3.31	p<.001	2.65	88	2.80	p<.01	2.27	88	3.58	p<.001
E2-C1	1.04	189	2.10	p<.05	1.89	103	2.25	p<.05	.58	103	.78	*
E2-C2	1.98	190	4.02	p<.001	3.40	88	3.50	p<.001	2.11	88	2.86	p<.01
C1-C2	.94	221	2.20	<.05	1.51	103	1.74	*	2.48	103	4.03	p<.001

* = not significant

Table II compares the mean difference for each group, between Test 1 and Test 2. While the data indicate that groups which were exposed to one or both variables received higher scores, generally, than the group which was not exposed to either variable, the sporadic fluctuation of mean differences among groups for the different parts of the test would suggest that the independent variables of this study produce no favorable effects of proficiency-retention over a two-week period in which no instruction is given.

TABLE II

	Mean Scores		Mean Difference
	Test 1	Test 2	
	Part I (43 items)		
E1	24.91	23.25	-1.66
E2	24.26	23.55	- .71
C1	23.50	22.51	- .99
C2	22.70	21.57	-1.33
	Part II (25 items)		
E1	15.24	15.27	+.03
E2	15.38	16.02	+.64
C1	14.02	14.13	+.11
C2	13.11	12.62	-.49
	Part III (20 items)		
E1	9.67	8.73	- .94
E2	11.09	8.58	-2.37
C1	9.48	8.00	-1.48
C2	7.27	6.48	- .76

DISCUSSION

Generally, successful learner achievement in the classroom depends on three factors: (1) the presentation of a well-articulated sequence of language structures and concepts, (2) the ability of the instructor to help the learner "internalize" the structures of the language without the interference of sophisticated grammar analysis or undue communication in the learner's native language, and (3) the motivation of the learner. Often, if the third factor is not present initially, it may be induced as a result of applying the first two factors.

The presentation of a well-articulated sequence of language structures is correlated with decisions of what materials should be presented together and which should come first. Decision-making of material presentation requires in-depth knowledge of language structure. Some specialists (Carroll, 1964: p. 4; Sachs, 1964: p. 14) have stated that teachers need to have a more precise understanding of the grammatical composition of the structures their students presumably learn to use. An understanding of language structure is gained, not by analysis of surface patterns alone, but rather by "looking" underneath the surface patterns and by correlating one structure with another. Such understanding of language structure can make the task of the teacher easier in providing pupils with a step-by-step build-up of structures, where this provision does not exist in the textbook.

If the view of the present investigator is correct, there is too much complex structure and too much transposition and deletion of sentence constituents in beginning sections of many first-year texts. It cannot be supposed that first-year learners transpose and delete sentence constituents as freely as a native speaker does. Nor can it be believed that pupils induce structure from ellipsed sentences, unless, of course, they are encouraged to make direct translation back and forth from one language to the other. On the other hand, it is supposed that, through a systematic, step-by-step approach to language structure, such as to present first a basic (or full) sentence pattern which gives rise to a new structure through some process, the teacher may guide the learner more efficiently toward desired goals of proficiency than he otherwise would do.

For example, in presenting or using interrogative pronouns linked to prepositions, it is relevant to show the relationship of the preposition to both the interrogative pronoun and the item replaced by the pronoun:

Juan se acuerda de la señorita

Juan se acuerda de ¿quién?

¿De quién se acuerda Juan?

If these relationships are not exposed, the student may, as practical experience has shown, be confused, since a frequent interrogative construction in his native language, English, allows for either a "dangling" preposition or no preposition at all (e.g., "Whom does John think about?" or "Whom does John remember?".

Presumably, language control is closely related to the language user's "understanding" of internal and external structural relationships. By internal relationships is meant the relation among the syntactic constituents within any given sentence pattern. External relationship means the relation of any given sentence pattern to another. It is supposed that the thoroughness of the pupil's learning parallels the extent to which a teacher is able to make these structural relationships known to the learner through classroom drilling.

The newly-organized description of language structures centers on the sequential development of related structures and explanations which stress those structural relationships. This description was employed in organizing review materials used in the experiment of this study (See Appendix A). The concepts of structural sequence and of explanations relative to structural relationships were employed as experimental variables. Although more rigorous experimentation and testing is needed in the area of arranging curriculum content and developing effective pedagogical presentations, test results obtained under specific conditions in this study are suggestive of certain points. First, the concepts just mentioned can be effective in teaching procedures to aid learners in the attainment of higher proficiency of auditory comprehension and oral production of certain syntactic patterns of Spanish. Second, one effective method of presenting material, then, may be to group related structures in sets, and, within a given set, the related structures may be presented by starting first with a basic sentence pattern, and, thereafter, presenting the processes whereby it is converted to a target structure of the set. Third, the effectiveness of these concepts may stem from the overview of the language structure they offer the teacher. This overview of language structure is relevant in providing the teacher with flexibility and versatility in organizing drill material to help guide the learner toward desired goals of language performance.

In light of test results, it is proposed that a model achievement level be defined in terms of related structures and logical sequences of related structures. Specifically, the proposal is made to group related structure into sets and, within

a given set, to sequence the structures by starting with basic patterns and proceeding to related, converted patterns. Again, it must be pointed out that no rigid arrangement of related structures has been established. No claim is being made here to the effect that a logical order of structures exists, which optimizes the efficiency of teaching.

Two other developments, built in part upon the language description, are proposed as part of the definition of achievement level. The first is a set of operational statements of expected learner performance (or terminal behavior) of the smallest, individual units of syntactic structures to be learned. The other description consists of performance tests to be used as criteria in the periodic demonstration of learner performance of individual syntactic patterns. The value of the operational statements of terminal behavior is seen in the way a teacher might use them as a guide in his personal approach to teaching individual elements of Spanish syntax. The performance test is an instrument employed by the instructor to check a learner's proficiency in using each kind of syntactic structure. When the learner satisfactorily fulfills the conditions of all performance tests, it may be said that he has completed Level II and is ready for the ensuing level(s).

The following grid could be used as a check-list to guide teachers in effectively moving individual learners toward the goal of terminating Level II, with all cells of the grid completed at that time.

	Auditory Comprehension	Oral Production
Nouns		
Determiners		
Adverbials		
Basic Patterns		
Verbal Aspects		
Negation		
Interrogation		
Relativization		
Noun Modification		
Nominalization		
Pronouns		
Imperatives		
Comparison		
Exclamation		
Passive Const.		
Alternate Sentence Patterns		
Deletions		

CONCLUSION

In most American schools today the development of a well-articulated foreign-language program remains one of the areas of major concern. Many students are learning foreign languages inefficiently; and one probable reason for this is poor coordination of the steps toward achieving a working knowledge of the language. If progress in the study of foreign language is to be accelerated, or if progress is to be improved at all, successive levels of student achievement must be defined and measured, as a part of a long-range effort to improve articulation of language acquisition.

This study aimed at two main objectives, in an effort to improve upon existing specifications for the syntactic structure to be included in Achievement Level II for Spanish. The first objective, prerequisite to the second, was to establish explicitly described language structures, relating the derivative structures to the more basic patterns. The description facilitated the attainment of the second objective: to specify in operational terms what the learner does when he uses correctly certain syntactic patterns of Spanish.

The purpose beyond these two objectives is the development of concepts to serve two fundamental educational aims: an ideal methodological approach to language instruction, and a standard of learner performance with respect to the structure of the target language. Some concepts related to these two educational aims were presented in the introduction of this study. It was claimed that decision-making procedures are important to curriculum operations, and the decisions need to be made on explicit grounds. Course content develops from discrete content items arranged in such a manner as to move, one item at a time, from what is relatively easy for the learner to what is relatively difficult. This arrangement is organized into the learning continuum, by grouping structures into sets and arranging the structures in a smoothly-articulated sequence. Finally, the teacher must have at his disposal an overview of the language structure and expected goals of student performance, in order to segment the learning continuum into optimally small, learning units.

Achievement scores of experimental testing suggest that learners who are taught systematically arranged language structures, and who are also given explanations concerning the structures, constituents and interrelationships, as presented under the specific conditions described in this study, demonstrate a higher degree of performance in the recognition and production of these language structures than learners not exposed to these conditions.

The differences in learner performance, disregarding different innate abilities (Lambert, 1963: p. 61), may be explained by inferring that different teaching procedures and materials help foreign-language

pupils attain varying degrees of proficiency. It is assumed, however, that the individuals' learning is more or less thorough to the extent that the teacher is able to guide the learner along a smooth transition from one structure to another so that the learner "understands" the grammatical structure he is learning through drill exercises. We conclude on this basis that one useful method of presenting the syntactic structure of a particular achievement level is to group related structures, and to explain their interrelationships.

In addition to language descriptions which order the structural patterns and explain their interrelations, psychological and educational considerations influence the organization of pedagogical material. Each class of pupils has different needs. The teacher must be sensitive to these needs, and decide which set of structures to present at a particular juncture of the classroom work. The operational statements of learner proficiency, it is proposed, serves to guide the teacher in making such decisions of strategy.

The teacher may use the language description as a background for selecting prospective language materials. At present there are no standard criteria for judging the value of teaching materials. On the basis of test results, it would seem that materials would be more desirable if they presented the related structures together as a unit, and started with the full basic forms before proceeding to deletions, other transformations, and transpositions of constituents.

More experimentation and rigorous testing must be carried out to determine what order of structures is the most effective for presenting each sub-system, and the system as a whole, to a given group of learners. We must answer specific questions: Can a logically-ordered presentation of relativized elements facilitate learning the process of relativization? Is the learner then better able to use the relative forms innovatively? Are sets of related structures, when presented together as a unit, learned better than when the same structures are spread out over a longer sequence, with different structures intermingled?

When answers to such questions are found, teachers will be in a better position to agree on the structures needed for each achievement level, and better equipped to coordinate the achievement levels more effectively.

REFERENCES

Allen, Harold B., Verna L. Newsome, Thomas H. Wetmore, Helen J. Throckmorton, and Enola Borgh, New Dimensions in English, Wichita, Kansas; McCormick-Mathers Publishing Co., Inc., 1966.

Ausubel, David, "Cognitive Structure and the Facilitation of Meaningful Verbal Learning," Journal of Teacher Education, Vol. XIV, No. 2 (June, 1963), pp. 217-222.

Banathy, Bela H., "The Systems Approach," Modern Language Journal, Vol. LI, No. 5 (May, 1967), pp. 281-289.

_____. A Theory of Selection and Organization of Content in Foreign Language Curricula, Ph.D. Dissertation, Berkeley, University of California, 1967, Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilms, 1966.

Belasco, Simon. "Nucleation and the Audio-Lingual Approach," Modern Language Journal, Vol. XLIX, No. 8 (Dec., 1965), pp. 482-491.

Blickenstaff, Channing B. and Frank J. Woerdehoff, "A Comparison of the Monostructural and Dialogue Approaches to the Teaching of College Spanish," Modern Language Journal, Vol LI, No. 1 (Jan., 1967), pp. 14-23.

Bloom, Benjamin S., Taxonomy of Educational Objectives: Handbook I--Cognitive Domain, New York: Longmans, Green, & Co., 1956.

Brooks, Nelson, Language and Language Learning, 2nd ed. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc. 1964.

Brooks, Nelson, Charles F. Hockett, and Everett V. O'Rourke, Language Instruction: Perspective and Prospectus, Bulletin of the California State Department of Education, Sacramento, Vol. XXXII, No 4 (Nov., 1963).

Bull, William E., Spanish for Teachers: Applied Linguistics, New York: The Ronald Press Co., 1965.

Carroll, John B., "Wanted: A Research Basis for Educational Policy on Foreign-Language Teaching," Harvard Educational Review, Vol. XXX, No. 2 (Spring, 1960), pp. 213-140.

_____, "Research on Teaching Foreign Languages," in Handbook of Research on Teaching, N. L. Gage (ed.) Chicago: Rand McNally & Co., 1963.

_____, "Linguistics and the Psychology of Language," Review of Educational Research, Vol. XXXIV No. 2 (April, 1964), pp. 119-126.

_____, Language and Thought, Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall Co., 1964.

Chomsky, Noam, Aspects of the Theory of Syntax, Cambridge: The M. I. T. Press, 1965.

Cordes, Henry Melvin, Effects of Selected Sequences in Pattern Practice in Spanish, Ph.D. Dissertation, Stanford University, 1966.

Flanagan, John C., "The Implications of Recent Research for the Improvement of Secondary Education," American Educational Research Journal, Vol. I, No. 1 (Jan., 1964), pp. 1-9.

Foreign Languages: Grades 7-12, Curriculum Bulletin Series No. V, Hartford, Conn.: State Department of Education, Sept., 1958.

Gleason, H. A., Jr., An Introduction to Descriptive Linguistics (Rev. ed.), New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1961.

Hayes, Alfred S., "New Directions in Foreign Language Teaching," Modern Language Journal, Vol. LXIX, No. 5 (May, 1965), pp. 281-293.

Katz, J. J. and J. A. Fodor, An Integrated Theory of Linguistic Descriptions, Cambridge, Mass.: M. I. T. Press, 1964.

Lado, Robert, Language Teaching: A Scientific Approach, New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc., 1964.

_____. Language Testing, New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc., 1961.

LaGrone, G. G., A. S. McHenry, and P. O'Connor, Entender y Hablar, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1961.

Lambert, William, "Psychological Approaches to the Study of Language, Part I: On Learning, Thinking and Human Abilities," Modern Language Journal, Vol. XLVII, No. 2 (Feb., 1963), pp. 51-62.

Lees, Robert B., "Models for a Language User's Knowledge of Grammatical Form," The Journal of Communication, Vol. XIV, No. 2 (June, 1964), pp. 74-85.

Mackey, William Francis, Language Teaching Analysis, Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1965.

Mager, Robert F., Preparing Instructional Objectives, Palo Alto, Calif.: Fearon Publishers, 1962.

McKinnon, Kenneth R., "An Experimental Study of the Learning of Syntax in Second Language Learning," unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass., 1965.

McMahon, L. E., "Grammatical Analysis as Part of Understanding a Sentence," unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Harvard University, 1963.

McNeill, David, "On Theories of Language Acquisition," in Studies in Language and Language Behavior (Harlan L. Lang, ed.), Progress Report III, University of Michigan, 1966.

_____, "Developmental Psycholinguistics," in The Genesis of Language (F. Smith and G. A. Miller, eds.), Cambridge, Mass.: M. I. T. Press, 1966).

Mead, Robert G., Jr., (ed.), Language Teaching: Broader Contexts, Reports of the Working Committees, "Research in Foreign Language Teaching: The Last Five Years," Northeast Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Language, 1966, pp. 12-42.

Mueller, K. A. L. Vargas, R. Franco, and D. Woodward, Spanish for Secondary Schools: Part 1 and 2, Level I, Boston: D. C. Heath and Co., 1962.

Nostrand, H. L., W. D. Foster and C. B. Christensen, Research on Language Teaching: An Annotated International Bibliography, 1945-64 (2nd ed. rev.), Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1965.

Oller, John W., La Familia Fernández, Wilmette, Illinois: Encyclopaedia Britannica Films, Inc., 1963.

Olsen, James, "The Coming Revolution in Textbooks," AV Communication Review, Vol. XII (Fall, 1964), pp. 337-343.

Pimsleur, Paul, D. M. Sundland, and R. D. McIntyre, Under-Achievement in Foreign Language Learning, New York: The Modern Language Association of America, 1966.

Politzer, Robert L., Teaching French: An Introduction to Applied Linguistics, New York: Ginn and Co., 1960.

_____, "Some Reflections on Transfer of Training in Foreign Language Learning," Vol. III, No. 3 (1965), pp. 171-178.

Postal, Paul, "Underlying and Superficial Linguistic Structure," Harvard Educational Review, Vol XXXIV, No. 2 (Spring, 1964), pp. 246-266.

Ramsey, M. M., A Textbook of Modern Spanish (Rev. by Robert K. Spaulding), New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1965.

Rivers, Wilga M., "Listening Comprehension,' Modern Language Journal, Vol. L, No. (April, 1966), pp. 196-204.

_____, The Psychologist and the Foreign Language Teacher, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1964.

Sachs, Norman P., "Application of Linguistics to Teaching," Modern Language Journal, Vol. XLVIII, No. 1 (Jan., 1964), pp. 7-17.

Sadnavitch, J. M and J. W. Popham, "Measurement of Spanish Achievement in the Elementary School," Modern Language Journal, Vol. XLV, No. 8 (Dec., 1961), pp. 297-299.

Saporta, Sol, "Applied Linguistics and Generative Grammar," in Trends in Language Teaching (Albert Valdman, ed.), New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1964.

Scherer, George A. C., and Michael Wertheimer, A Psycholinguistic Experiment in Foreign-Language Teaching, New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1964.

Spanish for Secondary Schools, Bureau of Secondary Curriculum Development, Albany, N. Y.: New York State Education Department, 1961.

Spolsky, Bernard, "Computer-based Instruction and the Criteria for Pedagogical Grammars," Language Learning, Vol. XV, Nos. 3 and 4 (1965), pp. 137-145.

Stevens, Claire E., A Characterization of Spanish Nouns and Adjectives, University of Washington, Studies in Linguistics and Language Learning, Vol. II, Seattle, 1966.

Stockwell, Robert P., J. Donald Bowen and John W. Martin, The Grammatical Structures of English and Spanish (Contrastive Structure Series), Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1965.

Torrey, Jane W., The Learning of Grammar, An Experimental Study, Progress Report II, Rev., A Report from the Department of Psychology, New London, Conn.: Connecticut College, 1966.

Valdman, Albert, "Programmed Instruction and Foreign Language Teaching," in Trends in Language Teaching (Albert Valdman, ed.) New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1966.

Van Dalen, Deobold B., Understanding Educational Research, (Rev.), New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1966.

Walsh, Donald D., "Articulation in the Teaching of Foreign Languages," in Curricular Change in the Foreign Languages, Princeton, N. J.: College Entrance Examination Board, 1963.

What Do We Know About Foreign Language Instruction?, Texas Education Agency, Austin, Texas, Bulletin 621, Dec. 1962.

Wolfe, David L., Roger L. Hadlich, and John G. Inman, A Structural Course in Spanish, New York: The Macmillan Co., 1963.

APPENDIX A

Group E1: Exemplary Review Materials

1. Basic sentence patterns with ser:

NP_1	ser	NP_2	Explain that NP_2 is related to NP_1. The verb ser makes the relationship possible; that is, in somewhat more abstract terms, in the structure A = B the "equals" sign (=) represents the verb ser (or any of its finite forms).

Examples:

El chico es mi amigo
Imán es mi perro
Imán no es mi perro
La señorita López es una persona simpática
La vida es un sueño
Miguel es un chico bueno
La casa no es una escuela
La calle es un camino
El día no es la noche
etc.

1.1 Item substitution drill

Teacher	Student
El chico es mi amigo	El chico es mi amigo
mi hermano	" " " mi hermano
un amigo bueno	" " " un amigo bueno
una persona simpática	" " " una persona simpática
un alumno simpático	" " " un alumno simpático
un mexicano bueno	" " " un mexicano bueno

etc.

1.2 Making Yes/No questions

Teachers	Student (Watch intonation pattern)
Imán es un perro.	¿Es Imán un perro?
El chico es mi amigo.	¿Es el chico mi amigo?
Miguel es un chico bueno.	¿Es Miguel un chico bueno?
Usted es alumno.	¿Es usted alumno?
etc.	

1.3 Question/Response drill

Teacher	Student (Watch intonation pattern)
¿Es Imán un perro?	Sí, Imán es un perro.
¿Es Imán mi hermano?	etc.
¿Es la señorita López una persona simpática?	
¿Es usted alumno?	
¿Es el día la noche?	
¿Es la calle un camino?	
etc.	

1.4 Students invent sentences

5. Basic sentence pattern with Vt:

NP_1 Vt NP_2 Point out the relationship of longer phrases and clauses (functioning as direct object nouns) to the simple nouns in object-of-verb position.

examples:

El profesor dice	algo
El profesor dice	la respuesta
El muchacho quiere	comer
Elena grita	"Buenos días"
Elena agrega	algo nuevo
María responde	que no va al parque
Amelia responde	que fueron a nadar
Pepito sabe	dónde está la universidad
Miguel pregunta	si mamá y papá fueron al camino
Miguel espera	que Emilio lleve a Gloria
etc.	

5.1 Item Substitution drill

Teacher	Student
El profesor dice algo	El profesor dice algo
la palabra	" " " la palabra
"El gusto es mío"	" " " "El gusto es mío
que pide el permiso	" " " que pide el permiso
etc.	
Usted espera algo	Usted espera algo
la hora	" " la hora
el permiso	" " el permiso
al señor	" " al señor
que Elena lleve a Imán	" " que Elena lleve a Imán
etc.	

5.2 Substitution drill

1st student (invents sentence using algo) e.g.	Teacher (gives cue)	2nd student
María dice algo	la palabra	María dice la palabra
María pregunta algo	si puede ir	etc.
Pepito sabe algo	que Imán está aquí	
El profesor hace algo	la pregunta	
El alumno contesta algo	la pregunta	
etc.		

5.3 Making Yes/No questions

Teacher	Student
María dice algo	¿Dice algo María?
El alumno quiere comer	¿Quiere comer el alumno?
El presidente Johnson sabe algo	¿Sabe algo el presidente Johnson?
etc.	

5.4 Question.Response drill

Teacher	Student
Dice algo María?	Sí, María dice algo.
etc.	

17. ¿Donde? asks the question Where? and is related to the adverb of place or location. Point out that it may be used singly or in combination with certain prepositions.

Derivation	Substitution	Rearrangement
Imán está aquí	Imán esta ¿dónde?	¿Dónde está Imán?
El perro está ahí	El perro está ¿dónde?	¿Dónde está el perro?
Paco espera en el parque	Paco espera ¿dónde?	¿Dónde espera Paco?
Los niños juegan en la calle	Los niños juegan ¿dónde?	¿Dónde juegan los niños?
María va a México	Maria va a ¿dónde?	¿Adónde va María?
El profesor hace preguntas en la clase	El profesor hace preguntas ¿dónde?	¿Dónde hace...?

17.1 Making Information questions

Teacher	Student
María va a México*	¿Adónde va María?
Paco va a Chile	¿Adónde va Paco?
El perro está en el parque	¿Dónde está el perro?

El alumno está en la escuela	¿	¿Dónde está el alumno?
Pedro llega a casa		¿Adónde llega Pedro?
Los niños se despiden en la escuela		¿Dónde se despiden los niños?
etc.		

*Point out the relationship of adónde to verbs of motion.

17.2 Question/Response drill-student invents question

1st Student	Teacher	2nd Student
¿Dónde está Imán?	en el parque	Imán está en el parque
¿Dónde está usted?	en la clase	Usted está en la clase
¿Adónde va Pedro?	a casa	Pedro va a casa
etc		

Teacher	2nd Student
¿Dónde?	¡En el parque!
¿Dónde?	¡En la clase!
¿Adónde?	¡A casa!

26. Spanish sentence patterns are flexible. That is, certain elements within the sentence have the flexibility of moving around to assume different positions. In the following drill attention is given to the subject noun and the adverbial element(s). The following is a rearrangement drill.

Teacher	Student
Pepito viene aquí	Aquí viene Pepito
Ustedes vienen pronto	Pronto vienen ustedes
Estoy también	También estoy
Tú dices algo ya	Ya dices algo tú
La vida es así	Así es la vida
Usted viene mañana	Mañana viene usted
Voy a eso de las dos	A eso de las dos voy
Está aquí	Aquí está
etc.	

27. Deletions:. Subject deletions. Explain that within an established context, the subject noun is generally not uttered. That is, either the verb-ending indicates who or what the subject of the verb is, or else (as in third person), once the speaker and listener have set the context, it is no longer necessary to continue expressing the subject again and again.

Teacher	Student
Yo estoy listo	Estoy listo
Tú estás listo	Estás listo

María es mi hermana	Es mi hermana
Pepito viene al parque	Viene al parque
Amelia responde que fueron al parque	Responde que fueron al parque

etc.

27.1 Question/Response drill. Explain that in the teacher's question the subject is mentioned and, thus, established. The student, then, may omit the subject in his answer, since, through the context of the verbal exchange, the subject is understood.

Teacher	Student
¿Viene Pepito al parque?	Si, viene al parque
¿Quiere usted el perro?	Si, quiero el perro
¿Es bonita la señorita?	Si, es bonita
¿Dice Paco "Buenos días"?	Si, dice "Buenos días"

27.2 Verbal deletions. Explain that within the given (and understood) context, a re-uttering of the verbal elements is unnecessary.

Teacher	Student
¿Quién va al parque?	Paco (or whatever)
¿Quién grita "María, María"?	Pepito "
¿Adónde va Paco?	Al parque
¿Cómo está usted?	Bien
¿Puede usted gritar mucho?	Sí, puedo
¿Puede María encontrar la calle?	Si, puede

etc.

Explain that underlying these phrases are fuller forms (e.g., Bien has underlying it the fuller form Estoy bien, etc.)

APPENDIX B

Criterion Test

Part I.

1. La señora está bien.
2. Aquí vienen los niños.
3. Tú gritas "Vámonos."
4. *Yo soy aquí.
5. La familia llega pronto.
6. Ahora están.
7. Va a la calle.
8. También va al parque.
9. Ahora está Pepito.
10. *Enrique está un chico.
11. *Los alumnos son en la clase.
12. Hoy contestan bien.
13. *Tú llamas nosotros.
14. *Pepito puede que a Imán.
15. ¿No quiere Amelia el perro?
16. *El libro es Juan.
17. *La señorita está María también.
18. Vamos a nadar pronto.
19. *¿Adónde contesta el profesor?
20. *¿Qué llegan los niños?
21. Enrique dice que no.
22. *El día es gracias.
23. *Emilio tiene con donde.
24. *¿Quién con amigos?
25. *Tenemos que ustedes.
26. *Donde va a Mexico.
27. Tu gritas que vamos a las dos.
28. María pregunta si tiene la familia.
29. *El niño llega cuando pronto.
30. ¿Qué es bonita?
31. *Pepito está que la mesa.
32. *La mamá espera responde.
33. ¿Es Gloria la niña de la señora?
34. A las ocho llegan a la escuela.
35. *Su amigo es bien.
36. *¿Cuándo María es?
37. *Mi mama pregunta somos buenos.
38. Los niños está en la casa ahora.
39. El alumno contesta la pregunta en la clase.
40. Los hermanos dicen "hola" bien.
41. *¿Qué está una casa?
42. ¿Puede gritar mucho usted?
43. *¿Cuándo llegan mañana a las dos?

Part II

1. Juan es _____.
2. Mamá vuelve _____.
3. María _____ aquí.
4. Pronto llegan _____.
5. La casa _____ de mi papá.
6. La señorita _____ lista.
7. María contesta _____.
8. Los niños _____ "Buenos días."
9. _____ sabe español.
10. El muchacho quiere _____,
11. También Miguel _____ "Hola Pepito."
12. María viene _____.
13. Pronto _____ Miguel.
14. Ellos van a _____.
15. ¿Dónde está _____?
16. Dices _____.
17. Los niños _____ a la casa.
18. Tú conoces a _____.
19. ¿Cuándo _____ usted al parque?
20. El hombre dice que la universidad _____ grande.
21. Miguel _____ que vamos a nadar mañana.
22. María responde _____ no sabe español.
23. _____ saludas a mamá.
24. Los hermanos conocen _____ María.
25. Pepito puede _____.

Part III

1. ¿Está bien Pepito?
2. ¿Es grande el parque?
3. ¿Viene aquí Gloria?
4. ¿Vive Enrique bien?
5. ¿Dice María que llega a las tres?
6. ¿Está el perro en el parque?
7. ¿[illegible] la casa suya?
8. ¿[illegible]iene usted quince años?
9. ¿Contesta Miguel al profesor?
10. ¿Sabe usted español?
11. ¿Cómo está usted?
12. ¿Quién es la señora?
13. ¿Qué está en la mesa?
14. ¿Adónde van los niños?
15. ¿Cómo es María?
16. ¿Qué dice el profesor?
17. ¿Dónde está la casa?
18. ¿Quién grita "Vámonos?"
19. ¿Cuándo llega María a casa?
20. ¿A quién conoce usted?